



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/710,315

07/01/2004

David S. Bonalle

70655.1800

4314

20322

7590

02/09/2006

SNELL & WILMER
ONE ARIZONA CENTER
400 EAST VAN BUREN
PHOENIX, AZ 850040001

EXAMINER

WALSH, DANIEL I

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2876

DATE MAILED: 02/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 10/710,315 | Applicant(s) BONALLE ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Daniel I. Walsh | Art Unit 2876 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-47 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7-04, 8-04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Receipt is acknowledged of the IDS received on 1 July 2004 and 5 August 2004.

Specification

2. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 1-47 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-47 of copending Application No.

10/708,827. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the '827 Applications claims are drawn towards a transponder, whereas the current application is drawn towards a smartcard. Transponders and smartcards are well known and conventional in the art, can be used interchangeably, and often a smartcard is referred to as a transponder and vice versa (see the prior art of Black below, for example). Accordingly, the Examiner maintains that a transponder and smartcard are obvious expedients, based on cost, design constraints, etc.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

I) In claim 1 of the present Patent Application, the Applicants claim: "A smartcard...reader...system...voice print sensor...verify...facilitate a transaction (see claim 1), whereas in the '827 Patent Application, the Applicants claim: "A transponder...reader...system...voice print sensor...verify...facilitate a transaction. " (see claim 1).

II) In claim 23 of the present Patent Application, the Applicants claim: "A method...smartcard...proffering...verification...transaction." (see claim 23) , whereas in the '015 Patent Application the Applicants claim: "A method...transponder...proffering...verification...transaction." (see claim 23).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

It is unclear to the Examiner what motion and body heat have to do with voice recognition. Based upon the Applicants specification, it appears that motion and body heat are means to authenticate a “real” biometric samples such as fingerprints, blood flow, etc., but is not applied to voice samples. The Examiner believes that the terms “motion” and “body heat” should be removed from the claim, as they do not appear to be related to detecting and verifying audio noise. The Examiner has interpreted the claim in light of the voice print sensor detecting and verifying audio noise associated with an electronic device.

Appropriate clarification/correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor

and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 1-9, 12-16, 20-30, 34-34, 43, and 45-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Black (US 6,925,565), in view of Haala (US 2005/0005172).

Re claim 1, Black teaches a smartcard configured to communicate with a reader, a reader configured to communicate with the system, a biometric sensor to detect a fingerprint sample, the sensor configured to communicate with the system (FIG. 1A). Though silent to a verification device to verify the sample, the Examiner notes that a transaction is authorized upon verification of the sample. Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to have a verification device in order to verify the sample as part of the authentication (security).

Black is silent to the biometric being a voice print that is detected by a voice print sensor to verify the voice print.

The Examiner notes that there are various types of biometrics to authorize users by, including voice prints/voices. The Examiner notes it is well within the ordinary skill in the art to use voice prints. Additionally, the Examiner directs the Applicant to the relevant art cited at the end of the action, which includes references that teach that fingerprint biometrics can be replaced with other biometrics, including voice prints, thus obviating such alternative biometrics. Nonetheless, Haala teaches that various biometric characteristics, including voice samples, can be used to identify individuals (FIG. 2).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Black with those of Haala.

One would have been motivated to do this in order to have different forms of biometric identification, well known and conventional in the art, to verify a user securely.

Re claim 2, the Examiner notes that the sensor communicates with the system via at least one of a smartcard, reader, and network (FIG. 1A of Black).

Re claim 3, it is understood that the biometric sensor is configured to facilitate a finite number of scans (one for example) in order to receive a sample (namely one).

Re claim 4, FIG. 5A+ (of Black) shows that the fingerprint biometric sensor logs at least one of a detected fingerprint sample, processed sample, and stored sample.

Re claims 5-6, Black teaches (col 6, lines 56+) that the customer record can be stored locally or remotely. The Examiner notes that though Black is silent to a datapacket stored on a database, Black teaches that the customer record can include biometric information, user information, etc. (FIG. 5A+ for example). Therefore, the Examiner notes that it would be within the skill in the art for such a collection of data can be interpreted as a data packet. It would have been obvious to store such information on a database, in order to have a well known and conventional means of storing data for quick retrieval and organization. It has been discussed above that the data can be stored remotely or locally. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to store it on the smartcard or a remote device based on security needs.

Re claim 7, it has been discussed above that samples are received and stored for providing security/authentication. It would have been obvious that the samples would be received by an authorized receiver in order to ensure security and reliability.

Re claim 8, though Haala is silent to an audio capture device, the Examiner notes that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include an audio capture device as part of the voice recognition in order to capture the audio for comparison, as is conventional in the art.

Re claim 9, it has been discussed above that an audio capture device (voice recorder/microphone/computer) is an obvious expedient to capture the voice sample as part of the processing and authorization process.

Re claim 10, such limitations are well known among voice recognition/voice processing. One would have been motivated to use such verification means, to verify that the voice sample matches.

Re claim 11, the Examiner notes that such security procedures are well known and conventional in the art for ensuring the authenticity of samples (Applicants own specification). One would have been motivated to use such procedures in order to ensure authentic samples.

Re claim 12, the Examiner notes that the proffered sample is compared to a stored/registered sample to see if there is a match (abstract of Black).

Re claim 13, it has been discussed above that a comparison is performed. The Examiner notes that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a local CPU/third party security vendor device to electronically perform the comparison, in order to have an electronic (automated) means to quickly and reliably perform the comparison, as is conventional in the art.

Re claim 14, the Examiner notes that as a sample is stored, it's interpreted as registered.

Re claim 15, Black teaches that a customer's account is linked to the biometric data, and can be used for payment and is linked to a credit or debit account (abstract, col 6, lines 46+).

Re claim 16, the Examiner notes that it is obvious that the system of Black would be used by a plurality of customers. As such, it would have been obvious that different people have different samples (unique), which would be associated with their different accounts.

Re claim 20, though Black is silent to the sensor providing notification upon detection of a sample, the Examiner notes that it is well within the skill in the art to provide notification that a sample has been detected, in order to provide indication to the user, that the sample was received and they don't have to keep offering a sample. As Black indicates when a sample has been authorized (transaction allowed) it would have been obvious to indicate when the sample is read/detected as a means to provide guiding information to the user. Additionally, the Examiner notes that the mere authorization of a transaction can be broadly interpreted as providing notification upon detection of a sample because authorization cannot occur unless the sample was detected.

Re claim 21, it has been discussed above that the device facilitates a financial transaction.

Re claims 22 and 34, though silent to secondary security procedures, the Examiner notes that such procedures such as PINs, codes, passwords, etc. are well known and conventional in the art. One would have been motivated to use such procedures for increased security.

Re claim 23, Black teaches a method for facilitating biometric security in a smartcard/reader system comprising providing a biometric to a biometric sensor communicating with the system to initiate verification of a biometric for facilitating authorization of a transaction (abstract).

Black is silent to the biometric being a voice print.

Haala teaches such limitations, as discussed above.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Black with those of Haala.

One would have been motivated to do this to have an alternative biometric that is able to authenticate an individual.

Re claim 24, the Examiner has interpreted the storing of the fingerprint sample with the system as an authorized sample receiver.

Re claim 25, registering includes proffering a biometric (abstract, FIG. 5A of Black).

Re claim 26, the limitations have been discussed above re claim 8.

Re claim 27, Black teaches that a sample is stored and that proffered samples are compared and verified to complete a transaction (abstract).

Re claim 28, Black teaches the step of proffering a biometric to a sensor communicating with the system to initiate verification, as discussed above. As discussed above, Black teaches that the information can be stored on the smartcard itself or remotely, depending on the desired security. Though silent to a database, a database is an obvious expedient as discussed above. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to process database information contained in at least one of the smartcard, reader, sensor, server, and reader system as a means to authenticate/verify a user.

Re claim 29, Black teaches comparing the proffered sample with stored sample (abstract).

Re claims 30, the limitations have been discussed above, re claim 13.

Re claim 32, the Examiner notes that such security procedures are well known and conventional in the art for ensuring the authenticity of samples (Applicants own specification). One would have been motivated to use such procedures in order to ensure authentic samples.

Re claim 33, the Examiner notes that as the system is used with more than one user (therefore more than one sample) it would have been obvious to detect/process/store a second fingerprint sample (of additional users).

Re claim 34, the limitations have been discussed above.

Re claim 35, Black teaches a method of facilitating biometric security in a smartcard reader transaction system comprising detecting a proffered biometric at a sensor communicating with the system to obtain a proffered sample, verifying the sample, and authorizing a transaction to proceed upon verification of the sample (abstract, and as discussed above).

Black is silent to a voice print sample as the biometric sample.

Haala teaches such limitations as discussed above.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Black with those of Haala.

One would have been motivated to do this in order to have an alternative biometric means to authenticate a user,

Re claim 36, Black teaches that the sample is detected at a sensor configured to communicate with the system via one of a smartcard/reader/network (FIG. 1A-1C).

Re claim 37, the limitations have been discussed above re claims 8-10.

Re claim 38, Black teaches detecting/storing/processing the sample (abstract).

Re claim 39, the Examiner notes that it would have been obvious to receive a finite number of sample during a transaction (abstract), namely, one, for example, for a transaction.

Re claim 40, the examiner notes that it is obvious that the samples are logged/stored at least temporarily, in order for them to be verified (stored in a buffer for example during comparison). Additionally, the Examiner notes that storing/logging signatures, transaction details, signatures associated with a transaction (more permanently then in a buffer) are well known and conventional in the art for record keeping purposes/security.

Re claim 41, as discussed above, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to detect/process/store a second sample, when the system is used by different people with different accounts and samples.

Re claim 42, the Examiner notes that such security procedures are well known and conventional in the art for ensuring the authenticity of samples (Applicants own specification). One would have been motivated to use such procedures in order to ensure authentic samples. Re claim 43, the comparison of a proffered sample to a stored/registered sample has been discussed above.

Re claim 44, the limitations have been discussed above re claims 8-10.

Re claim 45, the Examiner notes that the proffered biometric is indeed compared with a sample of at least one of a criminal, terrorist, and card member, as the sample is compared to a current card members sample, to authorize the transaction.

Re claim 46, verifying the sample using information contained on one of a local database/remote database/third party controlled database would have been an obvious expedient in instances where the data is stored remote from the smartcard. The biometric would be verified

by using information contained in a database, as a preferred means to organize data for efficient and easy storage and retrieval (remote or local).

Re claim 47, the verification of a sample using a protocol/sequence controller (interpreted as a processor) has been discussed above.

6. Claims 10, 11, 31, 32, 42, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Black/Haala, as discussed above, in view of Sharma et al. (US 6,480,825).

The teachings of Black/Haala have been discussed above.

Black/Haala is silent to verifying the voice print in at least one of the time domain, energy content across the frequency domain, stochastic models of the voice print, and template models of the voice print. Black/ Haala is silent to detecting/verifying audio noise associated with an electronic device.

Sharma et al. teaches such limitations (abstract). Sharma et al. teaches detecting/verifying audio noise (FIG. 7 which teaches an audio watermark (generated by an electronic device) that is detected and verified to verify the sample. Additionally, channel characteristics also are detecting/verifying audio noise generated by an electronic device (abstract).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Black/Haala with those of Sharma et al.

One would have been motivated to do this in order to authenticate a voice print as real.

7. Claims 16, 33, 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Black/Haala, as discussed above, in view of Martizen et al. (US 2002/0191816).

The teachings of Black/Haala have been discussed above.

Black/Haala is silent to different samples (of the same person) associated with different one of personal information, credit card information, etc. as claimed.

Martizen et al. teaches different registered biometric samples are associated with different personal information (different fingers with different accounts) (FIG. 6A).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Black/Haala with those of Martizen et al.

One would have been motivated do to this to permit multiple accounts to be security accessed with different biometric samples, for user convenience and security.

8. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Black/Martizen et al., as discussed above, in view of Moebs et al (US 2005/0065872).

The teachings of Black/Haala/Martizen et al. have been discussed above.

Black/Haala/Martizen et al. are silent to primary and secondary associating.

The Examiner notes that such associating is well known in the art (line of credit, for example). Specifically, Moebs et al. teaches that a customer can avoid overdraft by preauthorizing the financial institution to tie the customers' checking account to one or more of the customers other accounts (paragraph [0017]).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Black/Haala/Martizen with those of Moebs et al.

One would have been motivated to do this in order to provide for overdraft protection, for example.

9. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Black/Haala in view of Teicher (US 6,257,486).

Black/Haala is silent to mutual authentication upon verification of the biometric sample.

The Examiner notes that mutual authentication is well known and conventional in the art, as a security measure, to ensure that a valid reading device and device are communicating. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to authenticate upon verification of the sample, in order to ensure that the smartcard and reader are authentic and authorized to communicate with each other. Specifically, Teicher teaches a contactless smart card that being mutual authentication after an input (PIN) is entered (col 7, lines 35+).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Black with those of Teicher.

One would have been motivated to do this in order to employ well known security measures.

10. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Black/Haala in view of Goodman (US 2002/0043566).

The teachings of Black/Haala have been discussed above.

Black teaches that the transaction is blocked when the biometrics do not match, as is conventional in the art, but Black is silent to deactivation upon rejection of the sample.

The Examiner notes that it is well known and conventional in the art for card to be disabled, as a security measure, if a predetermined amount of failed attempts are detected, for example. Specifically, Goodman et al. teaches deactivation of a card if a predetermined amount of incorrect PIN attempts are detected (paragraph [0029]).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Black/Haala with those of Goodman et al.

One would have been motivated to do this in order to increase system security.

Though Goodman et al. is silent to a biometric input, the Examiner notes that Goodman et al. is relied upon for teaching disabling of access when a matching input is not received. It would have been obvious to disable the smartcard when biometrics don't match (biometrics replacing PIN input, as a more secure alternative).

11. Claims 4, 22, 34, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Black/Haala, as discussed above, in view of Black (US 2005/0122209).

The teachings of Black/Haala have been discussed above.

Re claims 22 and 34, Black/Haala is silent to secondary security procedures. Re claims 4 and 40, Black is silent to logging each proffered fingerprint sample.

Black '209 teaches such procedures through signature verification (abstract). Black '209 teaches storing of digital and electronic signature for record keeping purposes (paragraph [0125]).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Black/Haala with those of Black '209.

One would have been motivated to do this for increased security and record keeping purposes.

Additional Remarks

12. As an example, Janiak et al. (US 2002/0097142) teaches user indication. User indication is well known in the art to keep the user informed during a process. Typical user indication is readily seen at checkouts/point of sale devices, for example.

McCall et al. (US 2003/0132297) stores/logs signatures, Haala et al. (US 2005/0102524) teaches recording details is authentication fails and Segal et al. (US 2002/0066784) teaches bundling a signature with transaction database to effect proof of a transaction.

Hoshino et al. (US 6,636,620) teaches capacitive sensors detecting ridges and valleys, Kamei (US 5,901,239) teaches bifurcation and other features, and Tuli (US 5,942,761) teaches detection of body heat with fingerprints. The Examiner notes that the type of sensor devices for voice authentication as claimed are well known and conventional in the art.

Doyle et al. (US 2002/0095587) teaches a smart card with integrated sensor with a voice print sensor.

Baratelli (US 6,325,285) teaches a smart card that can have a microphone 116 and voice recognition software 212 for voice recognition, instead of a fingerprint.

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: Weinstein (US 4,453,074), Wang (US 5,917,913), Piotrowski (US 6,601,762), Brooks (US 6,898,299), Pitroda 9US 6,925,439), Black (US 2002/0178369), Seifert (US 2003/0112120), Jensen et al. (US 2005/0165684), Black (US 2005/0261972), Himmelstein (US 2005/0275505), Simon (US 2005/0212657), Timmins et al. (US 2005/0058262), Murashita et al. (US 2004/0255168), Hoshino et al. (US 6,636,620), Tuli (US 5,942,761), Kamei (US 5,901,239), Haala (US 2005/0102524), Janiak et al. (US 2002/0097142), and McCall et al. (US 2003/0132297), and Segal et al. (US 2002/0066784).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel I. Walsh whose telephone number is (571) 272-2409. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Lee can be reached on (571) 272-2398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Daniel I Walsh
Examiner
Art Unit 2876
1-23-06

